ER OF
parties in this
ne California
ity and is
f California,
oceeding by
oceeding by
j

3. On or about August 20, 2002, the California Board of Accountancy, Department of Consumer Affairs ("Board"), issued Certified Public Accountant Certificate Number 83993 ("Certificate") to Clete David Madden ("Respondent"). The Certificate expired on June 30, 2004.

JURISDICTION

4. Accusation No. AC-2007-07 ("Accusation") was filed before the Board, and is currently pending against Respondent. The Accusation and all other statutorily required documents were properly served on Respondent on December 18, 2006. Respondent timely filed his Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation. A copy of the Accusation is attached as exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

ADVISEMENT AND WAIVERS

- 5. Respondent has carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the charges and allegations in the Accusation. Respondent also has carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the effects of this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order.
- 6. Respondent is fully aware of his legal rights in this matter, including the right to a hearing on the charges and allegations in the Accusation; the right to be represented by counsel, at his own expense; the right to confront and cross-examine the witnesses against him; the right to present evidence and to testify on his own behalf; the right to the issuance of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents; the right to reconsideration and court review of an adverse decision; and all other rights accorded by the California Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable laws.
- 7. Respondent voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently waives and gives up each and every right set forth above.

CULPABILITY

8. The parties acknowledge that the basis for the Accusation's alleged violations of California Business and Professions Code section 5100, subdivisions (h) and (l), is the Order entered by the United States Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or

"Commission") on March 30, 2006, in its case *In the Matter of Clete D. Madden, CPA*,
Respondent (Administrative Proceeding File 3-12252) (see paragraph 6 of the Accusation).
Respondent herein, Clete Madden, without admitting or denying the findings of the SEC Order, except as to the Commission's jurisdiction over him and the subject matter of the Commission's proceedings, consented, effective March 30, 2006, to the entry of an *Order Instituting Public Administrative Proceedings Pursuant to Rule 102(e) of the Commission' Rules of Practice, Making Findings, and Imposing Remedial Sanctions ("Order")*.

- 9. Respondent understands that the charges and allegations in the Accusation, if proven at a hearing, constitute cause for imposing discipline upon his Certificate.
- 10. For the purpose of resolving the Accusation without the expense and uncertainty of further proceedings, Respondent agrees that, at a hearing, Complainant could establish a factual basis for the charges in the Accusation and that those charges constitute cause for discipline. Respondent hereby gives up his right to contest that cause for discipline exists based on those charges.
- 11. Respondent hereby surrenders his Certificate for the Board's formal acceptance.
- 12. Respondent understands that by signing this stipulation he enables the Board to accept the surrender of his Certificate without further process.
- 13. Respondent acknowledges that the reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution in this matter are \$3,414.10.

RESERVATION

14. The admissions made by Respondent herein are only for the purposes of this proceeding, or any other proceedings in which the Board or other professional licensing agency is involved, and shall not be admissible in any other criminal or civil proceeding.

CONTINGENCY

15. The parties understand and agree that facsimile copies of this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order, including facsimile signatures thereto, shall have the same force and effect as the originals.

2

3

7

10

11

15

21

23

27

28

///

///

ACCEPTANCE 2 I have carefully read the above Stipulated Surrender of License and Order and have fully discussed it with my attorney, Samuel J. Winer. I understand the stipulation and the 3 4 effect it will have on my Certified Public Accountant Certificate. I enter into this Stipulated 5 Surrender of License and Order voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and agree to be bound 6 by the Decision and Order of the California Board of Accountancy. DATED: 6.19.07 8 9 10 Respondent I have read and fully discussed with Respondent Clete David Madden the terms 11 and conditions and other matters contained in this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order. I 12 13 approve its form and content. 14

DATED: Jone 29, 2007.

Attorney for Respondent

ENDORSEMENT

The foregoing Stipulated Surrender of License and Order is hereby respectfully submitted for consideration by the California Board of Accountancy.

EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Attorney General of the State of California

GEOFFRE Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Complainant

DOJ Matter ID: SA2006102322 10333832.wpd

28

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. AC-2007-07
CLETE DAVID MADDEN 6617 Shadow Crest Drive Plano, TX 75093	
Certified Public Accountant Certificate No. 83993	
Respondent.	
DECISION AND	OORDER
The attached Stipulated Surrender of	License and Order is hereby adopted by th
California Board of Accountancy, as its Decision in	this matter.
This Decision shall become effective	on November 3, 2007
It is so ORDEREDoctober 4,	2007

FOR THE CALIFORNIA BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY

BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General of the State of California ARTHUR D. TAGGART						
Lead Supervising Deputy Attorney General GEOFFREY S. ALLEN, State Bar No. 193338						
Deputy Attorney General California Department of Justice						
1300 I Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 944255						
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 324-5341						
Facsimile: (916) 327-8643 E-mail: Geoffrey.Allen@doj.ca.gov						
Attorneys for Complainant						
BEFORE THE						
CALIFORNIA BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS						
STATE OF CALIFORNIA						
In the Matter of the Accusation Against: Case No. AC-2007-07						
CLETE DAVID MADDEN 6617 Shadow Crest Drive						
Plano TX 75093 Certified Public Accountant Certificate No.						
83993						
Respondent.						
Complainant alleges:						
Complainant alleges: <u>PARTIES</u>						
<u>PARTIES</u>						
PARTIES 1. Carol Sigmann (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official						
PARTIES 1. Carol Sigmann (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity as the Executive Officer of the California Board of Accountancy, Department of						
PARTIES 1. Carol Sigmann (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity as the Executive Officer of the California Board of Accountancy, Department of Consumer Affairs.						
PARTIES 1. Carol Sigmann (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity as the Executive Officer of the California Board of Accountancy, Department of Consumer Affairs. 2. On or about August 20, 2002, the California Board of Accountancy,						
PARTIES 1. Carol Sigmann (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity as the Executive Officer of the California Board of Accountancy, Department of Consumer Affairs. 2. On or about August 20, 2002, the California Board of Accountancy, Department of Consumer Affairs (Board), issued Certified Public Accountant Certificate						
PARTIES 1. Carol Sigmann (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity as the Executive Officer of the California Board of Accountancy, Department of Consumer Affairs. 2. On or about August 20, 2002, the California Board of Accountancy, Department of Consumer Affairs (Board), issued Certified Public Accountant Certificate Number 83993 (Certificate) to Clete David Madden (Respondent). The Certificate expired on						

JURISDICTION

3. This Accusation is brought before the Board, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.

4. Section 5100 states:

After notice and hearing the board may revoke, suspend, or refuse to renew any permit or certificate granted under Article 4 (commencing with Section 5070) and Article 5 (commencing with Section 5080), or may censure the holder of that permit or certificate for unprofessional conduct that includes, but is not limited to, one or any combination of the following causes:

(h) Suspension or revocation of the right to practice before any governmental body or agency.

(l) The imposition of any discipline, penalty, or sanction on a registered public accounting firm or any associated person of such firm, or both, or on any other holder of a permit, certificate, license, or other authority to practice in this state, by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board or the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, or their designees under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 or other federal legislation.

5. Section 5107(a) of the Code states:

The executive officer of the board may request the administrative law judge, as part of the proposed decision in a disciplinary proceeding, to direct any holder of a permit or certificate found to have committed a violation or violations of this chapter to pay to the board all reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case, including, but not limited to, attorneys' fees. The board shall not recover costs incurred at the administrative hearing.

FACTS

6. On or about March 30, 2006, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) issued an Order Instituting Public Administrative Proceedings Pursuant To Rule 102(e) Of The Commissions's Rules Of Practice, Making Findings, And Imposing Remedial Sanction. The SEC proceedings arose out of the failed audit of Tenet Healthcare Corporations's (Tenet) fiscal year (FY) 2002 financial statements and after-the-fact modifications to the working papers that created the false impression that the audit had been adequately performed. Respondent, who was the KPMG partner in charge of the Tenet audit engagement,

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 7. In August 2002, Respondent released an audit report containing an unqualified opinion stating that KPMG had performed the audit in accordance with Generally Accepted Auditing Standards (GAAS). When the audit report was released, however, Respondent [and the senior manager] knew, or reasonably should have known, that several procedures in critical audit areas had not been completed. Tenet included the audit report in its FY 2002 Form 10-K, which failed to disclose that Tenet's substantial earnings growth was driven by an aggressive pricing strategy designed to trigger an increase in outlier payments, a component of Medical revenue. Many of the unfinished audit procedures concerned outlier revenue even though Respondent had identified Tenet's disclosure deficiency in this area.
- 8. In October 2002, an industry analyst discovered that Tenet was exploiting the Medicare program through its aggressive pricing strategy. The publication of the analyst's reports in late October 2002 contributed to a 47% loss (more than \$11 billion) in Tenet's market capitalization. Government investigators, including SEC staff, began looking at Tenet, its strategy, and it Medicare outlier revenue. In November 2002, the Tenet audit team, led by Respondent [and the senior account manager], began modifying the working papers from the FY 2002 audit, despite public knowledge of the analyst's report, the dramatic decrease in Tenet's market value, and the pending government investigations. More than 350 working papers were modified and nine of the ten references to outlier payments in the working papers were added in November and December of 2002. Almost none of these improper modifications provided any indication that they had been made more than three months after the issuance of the FY 2002 audit report. After spending more than 500 hours modifying the working papers in late 2002, the audit team went on to make further improper changes to the FY 2002 working papers after receiving an SEC subpoena in July 2003. The net effect of the improper, after-the-fact modifications is that the working papers inaccurately reflect (1) that the Tenet audit was complete when the audit report was issued, and (2) that Respondent had sufficiently considered Tenet's outlier revenue growth and determined that Tenet did not need to disclose that trend.

]	1
2	2
3	3
4	ļ
5	5
. 6	5
7	,
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
~ ~	
25 26	
20	
41	

SA2006102322 10289633.wpd

	2.	Ordering CLETE DAVID MADDEN to pay the Board the reasona	able
costs of the	investigat	ion and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professi	ions
Code sectio	n 5107; an	nd,	

3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

DATED: December 5, 2006

Executive Officer

California Board of Accountancy Department of Consumer Affairs State of California

Complainant